

### REMARKS

Claims 1–21 were in the application as filed.

The Examiner requires restriction between the following allegedly patentably distinct species:

- Species A: Figures 1a-1c
- Species B: Figure 2
- Species C: Figure 3
- Species D: Figure 4
- Species E: Figure 5
- Species F: Figure 6
- Species G: Figure 7
- Species H: Figures 8a-8b
- Species I: Figures 9-14
- Species J: Figure 15
- Species K: Figure 16
- Species L: Figure 17
- Species M: Figures 18-20

Applicants provisionally elect Species M, Figures 18–20, claims 1, 6, and 11–21. Claims 2-5 and 7-10 are withdrawn from further examination, subject to rejoinder upon allowance of a generic claim. Applicants assert that claim 1 is a generic claim.

The Examiner also requires restriction between product and process claims. *Office Action, p.4, ¶4*. This restriction requirement is traversed.

The Examiner does not identify the alleged product and process claims. Indeed, none of the claims is addressed to a process. A review of the claims readily reveals that they are addressed solely to a product. Because the requirement for restriction is unsupported and inadequate, Applicants are denied the opportunity to fully and fairly respond to the restriction

Serial No. 10/598,104  
Filed: August 17, 2006  
Page 3 of 3

Examiner: Thanh Lam  
Group Art Unit: 2834

requirement. Applicants request the withdrawal of the restriction requirement founded on alleged product and process claims.

If there are any outstanding issues which the Examiner feels may be resolved by way of telephone conference, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned to resolve these issues. Early notification of allowability is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BARRY REGINALD HOBSON ET AL.

Dated: October 10, 2008

By: /Michael F. Kelly/

Michael F. Kelly, Reg. No. 50,859  
Joel E. Bair, Reg. No. 33,356  
MCGARRY BAIR PC  
32 Market Avenue SW, Suite 500  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503  
616-742-3500

G0408294.DOC